DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 354 589 EA 024 585

AUTHOR Pang, Sun-Keung Nicholas
TITLE School Climate: A Discipline View.
PUB DATE Aug 92
NOTE 35p.; Paper presented at the Regional Conference of the Commonwealth Council for Education Administration (7th, Hong Kong, August 17-21, 1992).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Discipline; *Discipline Policy; Discipline Problems; *Educationa Environment; Foreign Countries; Principals; *Punishment; *Rewards; Secondary Education; Secondary School Teachers
IDENTIFIERS *Hong Kong

ABSTRACT

School discipline is the foundation of education and ensures a safe and peaceful environment in which to learn and work. Establishing rules and the use of reward and sanction to enforce rules are the primary aspects of school rule formation. Incentive-based rules improve discipline better than punishment-based rules, which hurt the student-teacher relationship. Reward-based discipline also builds trust and fosters a positive environment. Research on school rules has examined the sanction and reward system, implicit or explicit designs, and rule dissemination, formulation, and enforcement. A survey of teachers and principals at 29 secondary schools in Hong Kong revealed that female teachers had a more positive perception of school-discipline climate and use of rewards than did males. Generally, girls' schools had a more positive discipline climate than boys' and coeducational schools. Less academically capable students also experienced more behavioral problems than more able students. Additional findings are as follows: School-discipline climate and teacher's attitudes toward reward and punishment are closely related; no relationship was established between school-discipline climate and the characteristics of school rules; characteristics of school rules do not affect teacher's attitudes toward reward and punishment. (Contains 22 references.) (JPT)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED354589

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sun-Keung Pang

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

SCHOOL CLIMATE:

A DISCIPLINE VIEW

PANG SUN KEUNG, NICHOLAS

(Sun-Keung Pang)

A Paper Presented at

The 7th Regional Conference

of

Commonwealth Council for Education Administration

August 17-21, 1992

Hong Kong

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EA 024 585

This article investigates the relationship between school climate and discipline practices in schools. School discipline is of paramount importance in the everyday life of schools in Hong Kong. Discipline is viewed as the foundation for the education process. Through disciplinary system, school should be a safe and peaceful place for students to learn and work. School discipline may have a great impact on school climate through its two vital steps: the ways of setting the school rules and the uses of reward and sanction to back up the school rules.

A school of positive climate is well-disciplined and full of trust, respect and faith. The school rules are generally set positively in order to enhance commitment. Students understand clearly and fully the expectations of teachers through the school rules. Students' esteems are respected. Students are willing to observe the school rules because of the demand of superficial goals. So, the spirit of self-discipline is fostered. In such a school, both teachers and students de-value the uses of punishment, because they regard punishments as evil. Punishment will hurt the teacher-pupil relationship and will humiliate the pupils. Punishment in long term is ineffective. On the contrary, rewards are highly valued and are popularly used to reinforce positive behavior. Thus the mutual trust and respect relationship is nurtured. Under such a positive climate, there is no need to use punishment at all.

In a school of negative climate, pupils are disruptive and the atmosphere is rather conflicting. School rules are generally set in a negative form in order to conserve commitment. Students are manipulated and they are threatened to obey the school rules. The atmosphere is of hostility and insensitivity. Students are continually subjected to criticism and failure. Serious disciplinary problems and criminal behaviors are likely to erupt. Teachers commonly employ punishment and generally justify punishment in a utilitarian and retributive way. Because the extensive use of punishment, the teacher-pupil rapport suffers. Under such situations, the uses of reward are properly de-valued and neglected.

It is common that different schools may have different climates in terms of school discipline. How the teachers and administrators perform in schools is determined mainly by their implicit values, beliefs, assumptions and philosophies, and the explicit prevalent norms, role expectation, rules, institutional and personal relationships. Thus the climate of a school is a product of the blending performances of the administrators, teachers and pupils. Nevertheless this final product (the climate) may also mean differently to different people in school, since what impressions a school have are determined by what they have perceived.

The aim of this study is to investigate the relationship of school climate and discipline practices. The study therefore addresses the nature and the tendencies of school discipline

climate. With respect to school discipline, this study only focuses on two aspects: the ways of setting school rules and the attitudes of teachers toward the use of reward and punishment. The study also examines the tenability of a number of hypotheses relating to school discipline climate and the attitudes of teachers toward the use of reward and punishment in the Hong Kong context. Since different schools would have different ways of setting school rules and different orientations in the use of reward and punishment, the study intends to reveal the relationship between school climate and disciplinary practices. Attempts have been made to answer such questions as (i) Is there any relationship between school discipline climate and the ways of setting the school rules? (ii) Is there any relationship between school discipline climate and the orientations of teachers in the use of reward and punishment in maintaining school discipline? (iii) Is there any relationship between the ways of setting the school rules and the orientations of teachers in the use of reward and punishment in maintaining school discipline?

Theoretical Framework

(a) School Climate

Early climate research that focused on elementary and secondary schools was based primarily upon the work of Halpin and Croft (1963). Other pioneer writers such as Tagiuri (1968), Finlayson (1973) and Thomas (1976) have developed or adapted questionnaires aimed at testing teacher and/or student percep-

tions of school climate. While the work of Epstein (1976) revealed that climate is related to student behavior, background, personality, aspirations, achievement, and to teacher evaluations.

More recently, the emphasis in school climate research has shifted from a management orientation to a student orientation. The conceptualization and measurement of pupil control as described by Willower and his associates (Willower, Eidell and Hoy, 1973) provided another perspective of the school climate. This perspective focused upon teacher-pupil relations rather than upon principal-teacher relations. Willower and his colleagues described pupil control as existing along a continuum from humanistic to custodial.

However, this study views the school climate differently from that of Willower and his associates. Instead of measuring the pupil control ideology and behavior of teachers, this study tries measuring the school climate directly on aspects of school life with respect to discipline. This study was found successful in evaluating, comparing and predicting school discipline climate on a continuum in terms of positive-negative typology. The School Discipline Climate Questionnaire (SDCQ) tries to measure directly the perceived features that are the constituents of discipline climate. The SDCQ was found to be a valid and reliable predictor and an assessor of discipline climate in schools.

Examples of important studies of discipline are the Highfield and Pinsent (1952) study of rewards and punishments, and Duke and Perry's research (1978) which showed that good school discipline is associated with small size, student responsibility, logical rules, and teachers' interpersonal skills. While the work of Wynne (1980) proved that climate is associated with discipline, rules, activities, student and staff attitudes.

(b) School Rules

In most school discipline systems, school rules are set as the guidelines for behavioral standards. School rules relate to the conduct of pupils. They are usually concerned with defining acceptable behavior for students both in and outside school, attendance, punctuality, dress and other administrative issues. The survey of school rules in this study has been based on the researches by Merrett and Natriello.

Merrett et al (1988) conducted a research and tried to obtain information about the nature and form of the school rule system and then to explore the sanction and reward system devised to uphold it. These included information about whether rules exist, in what form (implicit or explicit), how staff and students get to know them, who formulated them and when, whether they have been revised (when and by whom), who has the responsibility for ensuring the rules are kept and so on.

Natriello (1982) conducted a research to investigate the strategies employed by school administrators to obtain compliance in public schools. He referred school rules that are rationally based as comparative rules, while those are normatively based as definitive rules. Comparative rules usually a) specify a student behavior or performance; b) specify an organizational response; and c) a rate of exchange. These rules give students a clear notion of what kind of behavior is undesirable, and a clear idea of what they can expect if they engage in behavior. As such these satisfy demands for clear systems of rules for student conduct in school. Instead, definitive rules are based on a well-defined image of the school as an institution with a special social meaning having members with special identities. Instead of comparing negative student performance with an institutional response, definitive rules define the institution and its members. Definitive rules avoid specifying a negative student performance by emphasizing the nature of performance characteristic of the organization and its members. Definitive rules avoid specifying a particular organizational response or penalty by emphasizing that the most important implication of failure to perform in a manner characteristic of organization and its members is loss of membership. Finally, definitive rules involve no exchange formula. In his study, he concluded that if comparative rules function to conserve commitment and definitive rules function to enhance commitment, both may be necessary for maintaining compliance in school discipline.

(c) Uses of Reward and Punishment

McNamara (1986) studied the reward and sanction system which actually operated in schools. His conclusion was that attempts to ensure that the school rules were kept was chiefly through negative control systems.

There are two major theories of punishment: the so called "utilitarian" and "retributive" theories. The philosopher Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832), an utilitarian, sees that if punishment succeeds in deterring the wrong-doer, reforming him or preventing him from committing further acts of mischief, then and only then, is it justified. Any other form of punishment is just a sophisticated form of revenge. The retributivist theory emphasizes that punishment is justified for no other reason, just because the wrong-doer has committed an offense. Certain offences naturally merit certain punishments.

In the school setting, in the consideration concerning the justification of punishment, we should ask two questions: (1) Is punishment justified in schools? (2) Is a teacher justified in punishing a particular child for a particular offence? Arguments concerning the justification of punishment in an educational context have been put forward by R.S. Peters and by P.S. Wilson.

Peters (1966) distinguishes the concept of punishment from that of discipline. He sees discipline as a general notion connected with conforming to rules, whereas he regards punishment as

a more specific notion involving the intentional infliction of pain by someone in authority on somebody who has committed a breach of rules. He argues that punishment necessarily entails an act of retribution. Although the infliction of pain should be regarded as an evil, he argues that a small amount of pain meted out to those who commit wrong acts is less of an evil than the larger amount of pain which would arise if offences were allowed to go unpunished. In this case, the punishment on children in the school setting is justified. Further, in the views of Peters, punishment can assist in moral education, it helps to mark out what is right and wrong and brings home to children the consequences of their actions. However, punishment will bring the sense of alienation to children and does not in itself help children to develop an understanding of morality. Thus school punishment is necessary as a deterrent, but its positive educational value is doubtful.

A rather different argument is that of P.S. Wilson (1971), who refuses to see pain as necessarily evil. It is only pain inflicted for no good reason that is an evil; and since punishment is inflicted for good reason it need not be regarded as evil. Wilson regards punishment as part of a child's education in that it confirms for the child the existence of a moral order. When discipline breaks down, then, the child is blameworthy for he has acted against those principles which he acknowledges to be right. Wilson sees punishment as primarily a moral matter with an educative function rather than simply a social matter with a

managerial function.

In sharp contrast to the above views, the advocates of behavioral approach to teaching object the use of punishment, not because of ethical or moral considerations, but simply because punitive techniques are, in the long run, ineffective. Punished behavior is merely temporarily suppressed and is likely to recur once the punishment or fear of punishment is removed. Consequently, one needs to continue punishing to suppress a behavior over a period of time and the mere fact of repeating the punishment is likely to lessen its effectiveness, possibly precipitating the escalation to more severe forms. Instead of punishment, they use rewards extensively because rewards are themselves reinforcing. Rewards as 'positive reinforcement' will bring about and maintain desired behavior. While the undesired behavior will be weakened by ignoring it or by removing its rewarding consequences. Thus, in behavior modification, it is far more efficient to reinforce desired behavior than to punish all the unwanted behaviors.

Research Methodology

A questionnaire method was employed in this study. Two self-constructed questionnaires had been set, one for teachers and one for principals.

The questionnaire for teachers consists of three sections: (1) Section I - The School Discipline Climate Questionnaire (SDCQ) which was designed to determine the perceptions of school

discipline climate by teachers in schools; (2) Section II - The Reward-Punishment Orientation Questionnaire (RPOQ) which was designed to determine the attitudes of teachers with regard to the use of reward and punishment in maintaining school discipline; (3) Section III - The Information Sheet which was designed to seek the demographic and personal data from the respondents. The questionnaire was formulated in such a way that respondents only need to circle a number according to the appropriate responses.

The questionnaire for principals consisted of three sections: (1) Section I, the Survey of School Rules Questionnaire (SSRQ), was designed to seek information about how and in what ways the school rules had been set; (2) Section II, the Information Sheet was designed to seek data about the schools; (3) Section III, "Request For A Copy of School Rules of the School", was printed deliberately as a reminder for principals to enclose a copy or photocopy of school rules together with the completed questionnaire in the return envelope.

A pilot test had been undertaken to examine the applicability of the various sections of the questionnaire. Four aided secondary schools selected from my fellow classmates were invited to take part in the pilot study.

The researcher found that the SDCQ, the RPOQ and the SSRQ were able to differentiate schools and respondents accordingly.

Thus the validity of the questionnaires were established. On the other hand, reliability test was administered to the instrument on a sample of 80 respondents. Internal consistency estimates of the reliability of the three created scores: Discipline Climate Score, Reward Score and Punishment Score from the SDCQ and the RPOQ were determined using Cronbach's coefficient alpha. The values for Cronbach's coefficient alpha for the three scores were respectively 0.9119, 0.5416 and 0.7605. The SDCQ and the RPOQ on the whole could be claimed reliable, except a slightly low alpha value for Reward Score.

In the main research, the population used came from a selected sample of 29 aided secondary schools from Hong Kong. The selection was neither at random nor stratified. These aided schools were selected because the researcher had some connections with these schools and they had shown their willingness to participate in the present study, and because they formed a homogeneous group. The population bore similar characteristics. All these schools had management committee and governed by the Code of Aid.

The overall sample return rates of the various instruments are shown in Table 1. Table 2 shows the classification of the sample schools according to the demographic characteristics and table 3 shows the classification of the respondents who came from all these 29 schools.

Table 1

Return Rate of the Instruments

Instrument	Group	Number of Questionnaire Administered	Number of Usable Returns	Percentage
SDCQ	Teachers	1160	691	60%
RPOQ	Teachers	1160	691	60%
SSRQ	Principals	29	24	83%
School Rules	Principals	29	25	86%

Table 2

Classification of Schools

Demographic Item	Category	N	%
Type of School	Boys	5	17.2
	Girls	5	17.2
	Co-educational	19	65.6
History of School	Less than 5 years	1	3.4
	6-10 years	4	13.8
	11-20 years	12	41.4
	21-30 years	3	10.3
	31-40 years	1	3.4
	More than 40 years	8	27.6
F.1 Pupil Intake	Band 1	8	27.6
	Band 2	9	31.0
	Band 3	6	20.7
	Band 4	4	13.8
	Band 5	2	6.9
Religion Affiliation	With	14	48.3
	Without	15	51.7

Total number of sample school = 29

Note: Band 1 pupils are the most able pupils whereas Band 5 pupils are the least able ones.

Table 3

Classification of Respondents

Demographic Item	Category	N	%
Sex	Male	329	47.6
	Female	359	52.0
	Missing value	3	0.4
Age	20-29	268	38.8
	30-39	300	43.4
	40-49	99	14.3
	50-59	19	2.7
	above 60	1	0.1
	Missing value	4	0.6
Rank	PGM/SGM	177	25.6
	GM	304	44.0
	PAM/SAM/AM	84	12.2
	CM	125	18.1
	Missing value	1	0.1
Post	Prefects of Study	65	9.4
	Discipline Teachers	105	15.2
	Counseling Teachers	94	13.6
	Career Teachers	44	6.4
	ECA Teachers	43	6.2
	Others	340	49.2
Teaching Experience	Less than 3 years	154	22.3
	4-6 years	127	18.4
	7-10 years	158	22.9
	11-20 years	206	29.8
	More than 20 years	46	6.7
Qualification	Teachers' Cert.	179	25.9
	Bachelor Degree	147	21.3
	Degree + Cert. Ed.	304	44.0
	Master Degree	53	7.7
	Doctor Degree	1	0.1
	Others	7	1.0

Total of respondents = 691

Note: PGM = Principal Graduate Master; SGM = Senior Graduate Master; GM = Graduate Master; PAM = Principal Assistant Master; SAM = Senior Assistant Master; AM = Assistant Master; CM = Certificate Master. PGMs, SGMs and GMs are those graduate teachers from Universities whereas PAMs, SAMs, AMs and CMs are those teachers from Education Colleges. PGM and SGM are the promotion ranks for the GMs and PAM, SAM and AM are the promotion ranks for CMs.

Responses to the instruments were scored. The data were analyzed by frequency counting, crosstabulation tables and description of subpopulations, so that the general characteristics of the respondents were known to the researcher. Demographic information on each respondent and school was coded and various statistical methods were used in order to test the hypotheses and the research questions which guided the study. The internal consistencies of the instruments were computed by using the Cronbach's coefficient alpha.

Analysis of variance and the Scheffe test of multiple comparison were also used to determine the effects of the demographic variables on the dependent variables: the perception of school discipline climate and the reward-punishment orientation of teachers. A two-tailed t-test for the difference between the means of two independent samples was also used.

For the analysis of the characteristics of school rules, simple frequency counts were performed. The means, medians, and standard deviations for the total sample of questionnaires on the total sample copies of school rules were computed in this study. Two other ratios were created to describe the characteristics of school rules: Ratio-RP which is a value obtained by dividing the number of rules of reward by the number of rules of punishment and Ratio-DC which is a value obtained by dividing the number of definitive rules by the number of comparative rules. Then the general picture and information of school rules of a selected sample of aided secondary schools in Hong Kong could be depicted.

The relationship between the school discipline climate and the reward-punishment orientation was formulated by utilizing the Pearson Product Moment Correlation test.

All hypotheses in this study were tested at the 0.05 level of significance.

Research Findings and Discussion

(a) Teachers' Perceptions of School Discipline Climate and their Reward-Punishment Orientations

691 teachers responded to both the SDCQ and the RPOQ. Their responses were scored and recoded for testing the hypotheses. The results of hypothesis testings are shown in Table 4 and Table 5. The empirical findings are summarized and discussed as follows.

Table 4 (a) and (b):

Analysis of Variance for the Perceptions of School Discipline Climate from All Respondents

(a) By T-test:

Demographic Characteristic	Group	N	DC-Score	T-value	2-Tailed Probability
Sex	Male	329	92.5775	-2.35	0.019*
	Female	359	95.4513		
Pastoral Care	Pastoral	199	93.8744	0.34	0.731
	Non-past	152	93.2895		

Teaching Experience	≤ 10 years	439	91.6743	-5.23	0.000*
	> 11 years	252	98.2421		
Religion Affiliation	With	367	95.4114	2.35	0.019*
	Without	324	92.5494		

(b) By F-test:

Demographic Characteristic	Group	N	DC Score	F-Ratio	F-Probability
Age Group	20-29	268	91.8731	12.7133	0.0000*
	30-39	300	93.4333		
	≥ 40	119	100.5378		
Rank	PGM/SGM	177	97.2542	3.5539	0.0142*
	GM	304	92.5691		
	PAM/SAM/AM	84	94.9405		
	CM	125	92.8640		
Qualification	Teacher	179	93.9721	0.8610	0.4610
	Bachelor	147	92.5442		
	Degree + C	304	94.5954		
	Master d	53	96.2264		
School Type	Boys'	114	88.7193	77.2415	0.0000*
	Girls'	131	108.1832		
	Co-educa	446	91.2915		
School History	≤ 10 ye	104	84.8462	38.7355	0.0000*
	11-20 ye	313	91.4856		
	21-40 ye	106	96.0000		
	> 40 ye	168	103.3750		
Intake of F.1 Pupils	Band 1	220	105.2318	85.5072	0.0000*
	Band 2	179	95.6536		
	Band 3	150	88.2000		
	Band 4	92	82.6630		
	Band 5	50	77.8800		

"*" denotes a significant difference at 0.05 level.

Table 5 (a) and (b):

Analysis of Variance for the Reward-Punishment Orientation of Teachers from All Respondents

(a) By T-test:

Demographic Characteristic	Group	N	RP-Ratio	T-value	2-Tailed Probability
Sex	Male	329	0.8918	-3.09	0.002*
	Female	359	0.9344		
Pastoral Care	Pastoral	199	0.9125	-0.35	0.723
	Non-past	152	0.9200		
Teaching Experience	< 10 years	439	0.9169	0.44	0.658
	> 11 years	252	0.9106		
Religion Affiliation	With	367	0.9172	0.40	0.692
	Without	324	0.9117		

(b) By F-test:

Demographic Characteristic	Group	N	RP-Ratio	F-Ratio	F-Probability
Age Group	20-29	268	0.9107	2.3891	0.0925
	30-39	300	0.9035		
	≥ 40	119	0.9461		
Rank	PGM/SGM	177	0.9037	0.3442	0.7934
	GM	304	0.9157		
	PAM/SAM/AM	84	0.9263		
	CM	125	0.9180		
Qualification	Teacher	179	0.9277	0.7844	0.5029
	Bachelor	147	0.8969		
	Degree + C	304	0.9170		
	Master d	53	0.9186		
School Type	Boys'	114	0.8878	7.1352	0.0009*
	Girls'	131	0.9665		
	Co-educa	446	0.9062		
School History	≤ 10 years	104	0.8828	1.8098	0.1440
	11-20 years	313	0.9112		
	21-40 years	106	0.9271		
	> 40 years	168	0.9326		
Intake of F.1 Pupils	Band 1	220	0.9584	5.8271	0.0001*
	Band 2	179	0.9153		
	Band 3	150	0.8843		
	Band 4	92	0.8819		
	Band 5	50	0.8706		

"*" denotes a significant difference at 0.05 level.

1. Female teachers in schools usually have a more positive perception of school discipline climate and have a greater reward orientation than male teachers. It appears that a gender bias exists between female and male teachers. The result was found to be consistent with the findings by Willower, Eidell and Hoy (1973) that the female secondary teachers tended to be more humanistic in Pupil Control Ideology than the male teachers. The variable of sex is a factor in influencing both the perception of school discipline climate and the reward-punishment orientation of teachers.

2. Generally, girls' schools show a more positive school discipline climate than boys' and co-educational schools and teachers in girls' schools are usually more reward-oriented than those in boys' and co-educational schools. Thus the type of school is one of the determinants affecting the school discipline climate and the reward-punishment orientation of teachers. It is commonly believed that girls are quieter, more conforming, more verbally and intellectually oriented, whereas boys are physically active, aggressive and interested in the manipulation of physical objects (Maccoby, 1967). Findings in Hong Kong context are also consistent with the research findings of D.K. Smith (1978) that teachers respond to boys' and girls' behaviors differentially. Teachers as the socialization agents in classroom usually employ the sensitizing techniques and inductive techniques to deal with the student behaviors. Sensitizing techniques, which emphasize the behavioral situation and the external risk of punishment, are more frequently utilized in response to boys' aggressive and dependent behaviors than to girls. Inductive techniques, which

emphasize acceptance of the students and student responsibility, are directed more to girls than to boys.

3. It is statistically supported that there are differences in both the school discipline climate and the reward-punishment orientation of teachers in schools of different categories of intake of F.1 pupils. Category of intake of F.1 pupils is one of the variables influencing both the school discipline climate and the reward-punishment orientation of teachers in these schools. It is believed that pupils who are academically less able (e.g. band 5) will have more behavioral problems than the more able pupils (e.g. band 1). Since the high achiever may have a more promotive and supportive contact from their teachers, whereas low achievers have a greater proportion of conflict with their teachers.

4. In the perception of school discipline climate, variables such as age, rank and teaching experience appear to be determinants to influence the result. A teacher who is older and with more experience in teaching have a more positive perception of the school discipline climate. As compared to the younger teachers, they may have more life experience and be more mature. Their positive perceptions may mean that they have well adapted to the school situation and therefore they are more patient and willing to accept the present environment. Rank is only a determinant for PGM and SGM but has no influence on the perception of school discipline climate for GM, CM, AM, SAM and PAM. It may reveal

that the discipline climate within a school is generally poor in the lower forms. It is found that most unruly and delinquent behavior of pupils occurred in Form 1 to 3 (Education Department, 1991a). PGM and SGM are those senior teachers who usually teach the senior forms, e.g. Form 4 to 7, thus they are less exposed to the disruptive students and generally have a more positive perception of school discipline climate.

5. No evidence is found to support the hypotheses that qualifications of teachers and organizational positions are the determinants in the perception of school discipline climate. The amount of education the teachers received does not influence their perceptions to a great extent. On the other hand, though teachers in schools may perform different functions as academic, disciplinary, counseling, and activity, etc., the differentiation among these functional posts is not great. It may seem that the roles of teacher are more or less homogeneous and not clearly well defined. Teachers in schools usually have to play multiple roles, sometimes as disciplinarians, as counselors or social workers, as parents and even as diplomats or detectives, etc. There is no significant difference in the perception of school discipline climate between pastoral and non-pastoral teachers. The grouping of discipline and counseling teachers as pastoral teachers may not be appropriate at this moment. Pastoral care may be a new term to many teachers and schools. The development, the concepts and the systems of pastoral care are only at the primitive stage in Hong Kong schools.

6. History of schools and religion affiliation are the relative significant determinants in the school discipline climate. In Hong Kong, schools with longer history have relative stronger traditions and well established systems. These schools are usually prestigious in both academic achievement and conduct of the students. Religious schools generally have more positive discipline climate, since religious education, value education, moral education and civic education are highly emphasized.

7. With regard to reward-punishment orientation, only sex is found to be a determining variable. Those variables as age, rank, organizational position, teaching experience, qualification of teachers, history of school and religious background of schools are all found to have no influence in determining the attitude of teachers toward the use of reward and punishment in schools. It is speculated that such attitudes are more critically determined by implicit factors like characters, personality, values and beliefs of teachers rather than explicit factors as mentioned above. It needs further research evidence to support such speculation.

(b) Characteristics of School Rules

Twenty-five copies of school rules were collected and then analyzed. The results of the analysis are shown in Table 6, 7 and 8 respectively. As for ways of setting the school rules, the following features were found:

1. Most schools had an explicit rule structure.

2. The rules were made available and written in student's handbooks.

3. Usually school rules were drawn up once the schools were established.

4. The formulation, modification and execution of school rules were mostly the responsibility of Discipline Committee and Discipline Masters.

5. However, students was the group of people least involved in formulation and modification of school rules.

6. School rules were usually subjected to changes accordingly and were modified every year to cope with the change in environment.

With respect to the characteristics of school rules, four features were investigated and the results were found as follows:

1. The number of items in school rules could vary to a very wide range from 17 to 240. It was found that 20% of the responded schools had the number of items fall in the range 10-29, 40% in range 30-69, 24% in range 70-99 and 16% of the schools having rules of more than 100 items.

2. From all the sample copies of school rules, totally 27 categories covering the aspects of school life and order were identified. The most frequent five categories of school rules appeared were found to be: (i) Attendance; (ii) General Behavior

(In-School); (iii) Rules of School Uniform; (iv) System of Reward and (v) System of Punishment.

3. Only 17 schools had explicit systems of reward and punishment in their school rules. The Ratio-RP was calculated by dividing the number of rules of reward by the number of rules of punishment. A mean Ratio-RP was found to be 0.741, i.e. in general, more rules stating how to punish rather than how to reward students in schools were found.

4. From the 25 sample copies of school rules, the Ratio-DC was computed. The Ratio-DC was calculated by dividing the number of definitive rules by the number of comparative rules. A mean value of 2.051 was obtained. Two extreme cases were obtained. The minimum value of Ratio-DC was 0.015, i.e. there was a school where the number of comparative rules was 67 times that of definitive rules. The maximum value of Ratio-DC was 16, i.e. there was a school where the number of definitive rule was 16 times that of comparative rules. 13 schools had Ratio-DC values greater than or equal to 1 i.e. they had more rules written in a definitive way.

Table 6 (a) and (b)

Statistics of Number of Items in School Rules

(a)

total no. of rules set out (in ranges)	no. of schools (percentage)
10 - 29	5 (20%)
30 - 69	10 (40%)
70 - 99	6 (24%)
> 100	4 (16%)

(b)

Mean	71.160	Mode	43.000	Std dev	50.482
Minimum	17.000	Maximum	240.000	Sum	1779.000

Table 7

Categories of School Rules

Group	School Rule Category	Frequency
Most Frequent	(A) Attendance (Leave/Absence/Late Arrival)	23
	(B) General Behavior (In-School)	20
	(C) Rules of School Uniform	19
Frequent	(D) System of Reward	17
	(E) System of Punishment	17
Less Frequent	(F) Classroom Discipline	12
	(G) Criminal Offences	10
	(H) Examination and Promotion Regulations	8
	(I) Regulations on E.C.A.	8
	(J) General Behavior (Out-of-School)	7

In-frequent	(K) Regulations of Homework and Assignment	5
	(L) School Philosophy (Aims/Objectives/Spirit)	5
	(M) Rules of Assembly and Gathering	5
	(N) Care of Public and Private Property	5
	(O) Safety Rules of Lab. & Special Rooms	4
	(P) Out of Bounds	3
	(Q) Student-on-duty System	3
	(R) Regulations of Consuming Food	3
	(S) Rules of General Order	2
	(T) Rules of Social Behavior e.g. Courtesy	2
	(U) Responsibility of Monitors and Monitresses	2
	(V) Reminders of What to be Brought to School	1
	(W) Regulations of Publicity and Posting Notice	1
	(X) Rules of Outings and Picnic	1
	(Y) Rules of Correspondence and of Use of Tel.	1
	(Z) Rules of Fire Drill	1
	(#) Regulations of Transport and Road Safety	1

(c) Effects of Teachers' Reward-Punishment Orientation and School Rules on School Discipline Climate

The respective mean values of DC-Score, RP-Ratio, Ratio-RP and Ratio-DC for each school are shown in Table 8. The Pearson Product Moment Correlation test among these variables was computed and the results are shown in Table 9.

The findings indicate that:

1. The school discipline climate and the overall attitudes of teachers toward the use of reward and punishment are closely related. Teachers in schools of more positive discipline climate are generally more reward-oriented. On the contrary, teachers in schools of less positive discipline climate are more punishment-oriented.

These findings lead to support the findings of Topping (1983) that reward is more effective in producing good behavior, whereas punishment makes little difference one way of the other and, if applied inappropriately, it may increase disruption and misbehavior. Thus positive discipline climate can be achieved with more use of reward and less use of punishment.

2. The relationship between the school discipline climate and the characteristics of school rules is not established. Whether the school rules are written in a more definitive way or in a more comparative way, with more reward items or with more punishment items, is found to have no influence on the school discipline climate.

Table 8

Summary Data of Mean of Discipline Climate Score, RP-Ratio, Ratio-RP and Ratio-DC

SCHOOL	Mean Discipline Climate Score	Mean Value of RP-RATIO	Mean Value of RATIO-RP	Mean Value of RATIO-DC
1	92.8636	.9486	1.67	.02
2	93.2174	.9300	.	.
3	103.0000	.9122	.33	.46
4	113.0000	1.0255	.	16.00
5	101.9286	.9045	.38	1.03
6	89.6500	.8563	.83	1.00
7	77.1765	.7981	.50	10.40
8	99.8636	.8855	.	.
9	89.4242	.9129	.11	.06
10	76.0000	.8361	.	.28
11	104.6786	.9647	.	.20
12	110.0741	.9351	.05	1.03
13	96.6333	.8606	1.00	.89
14	82.8214	.8598	.95	.80
15	93.2667	.8923	.96	.96
16	79.7917	.9074	.24	.48
17	100.8000	.9657	.	1.23
18	96.9688	.9329	1.00	.43
19	82.5600	.8967	1.00	.13
20	83.8421	.9149	.	.58
21	74.2500	.8720	.	.
22	80.3333	.8480	1.40	2.33
23	109.9444	.9567	.57	4.67
24	91.2587	.8689	.	1.42
25	109.2083	1.0675	.75	2.00
26	80.0606	.8767	.40	1.12
27	105.2941	.9320	.	2.56
28	86.7857	.9170	.	.
29	112.2857	.9915	.	1.21
No. of cases	29	29	17	25

Number of cases listed = 29

"." Value Missing

Table 9

Correlations among the Mean DC-Scores and the Mean Values of RP-Ratio, the Ratio-RP and the Ratio-DC

Correlations	RP-RATIO	RATIO-RP	RATIO-DC
DC-SCORE	.7590 (29) P= .000	-.2032 (17) P= .434	.2087 (25) P= .317
RP-RATIO	---	-.0537 (17) P= .838	.1585 (25) P= .449

(Coefficient / (Cases) / 2-tailed Significance)

* Significant difference at 0.05 level.

These findings are found to be contrary to the findings of the research conducted by Natriello (1982). In his study, he concluded that comparative rules function to conserve commitment and definitive rules function to enhance commitment. Both may be necessary for maintaining compliance in school discipline. However, the relationship between school discipline climate and the ways of writing the school rules is not found in this study.

There is considerable literature that has attempted to classify and categorize different kinds of school rules (Hargreaves et al, 1975; Tattum, 1982). Essentially school rules are of two kinds: formal and informal. The former are often written down as part of the school's public presentation and include items such as regulations of attendance and leaves or school uniforms. The latter are largely unwritten and arise in the general course of the school day and involve numerous acts relat-

ing to standards of behavior both inside and outside the classroom. Infringements of both formal and informal rules may attract sanctions. However, research findings of this study reveal that the explicit formal rules have no effect on the school discipline climate whilst the effect of implicit informal rules have not been investigated in this study and need further research.

3. Similarly, it is found that the characteristics of school rules as mentioned above have no effect in determining the attitudes of teachers toward the use of reward and punishment in school. More definitive rules and more items of reward rules in school rules do not render teachers to use reward more extensively.

Wertham (1963) has pointed out the importance of the legitimacy of rules in schools both from the pupil's and teacher's point of view. He concluded in a study of American high school pupils that if pupils perceive rules as illegitimate ones, the enforcement of rules by teachers may provoke an unintended and unanticipated response that may precipitate a confrontation. Teachers are then no longer to impose their authority in respect of rules in general. Naturally, school rules appear to be dummy if teachers do not share and recognize its legitimacy.

An interesting but not surprising issue in Hong Kong schools is that double standard exists. It is believed that most schools have set up their own form of disciplinary system. In these

systems, there are the official formulation of school rules and the accompanying back-up system of reward and punishment. These rules and regulations are mostly written in students' handbooks. They are claimed to be official and legitimate. It is expected that all members of staff and all students should observe these rules. An experience to the researcher is that only some teachers and students would recognize the "official" position of the school rules and regulations i.e. they are not universally accepted. Thus, those teachers and students who do not compromise with the standards set by the official authority may create their own "hidden and informal rules" and own "systems of reward and punishment". Thus they would not perform accordingly to the expectations and standards as claimed to be official in school rules. Which will influence the school discipline climate to a greater extent -- the official and formal school rules and the accompanying system of reward and sanction or the hidden and informal prevalent rules and systems created within the school? Further investigation on this issue is needed.

Conclusion

In conclusion, it seems that school discipline climate and teachers' reward-punishment orientation are closely related. The 29 sample schools are successfully differentiated into a continuum of school discipline climate. Some schools are found to be more positive in discipline climate than the others. More positive discipline climate is generally found in girls' schools, schools of long history, schools having better intake of pupils

and schools with religion affiliation. Teachers in these schools are mostly reward-oriented i.e. they use more reward than punishment in dealing with the behavior of pupils and school discipline. One question which remains unsolved is that whether a school of more positive discipline climate renders teachers to be more reward-oriented and less punishment-oriented or a greater reward orientation of teachers in a school renders a more positive discipline climate in that school. To solve this question, it needs further research.

School rules is the official and formal documentation which serves as instructions and guidelines of behavior to both teachers and students. However, the legitimacy and the effect of school rules are not found in most schools. It seems to be a general case that school rules have no effect on both the discipline climate and the attitude of teachers toward the use of reward and punishment. It reveals that the informal rules is far more important than the formal rules in the governing of the dynamics of school discipline. Thus, the belief and value systems, the actual procedures, routines and policies that exist in schools are the major determinants to both discipline climate and teachers' attitudes toward the use of reward and punishment. The formulation of relationship among these determinants again needs further research.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

Bentham, J. Principles of Morals and Legislation edited by Burns, J.H. and Hart, H.L.A. (1970). University of London: Athlone Press, p.203.

Duke, D.L., & Perry, C. (1978). Can alternative schools succeed where Benjamin Spock, Spiro Agnew and B.F. Skinner have failed? Adolescence, 13 375-392.

Education Department (1991). Report of Survey on Unruly and Delinquent Behavior of Pupils in Secondary Schools for the School Year 1989/90, Education Department: The Statistics Section.

Epstein, J.L., & McPartland, J.M. (1976). The concept and measurement of the quality of school life. American Educational Research Journal, 13, 15-30.

Finlayson, D.S. (1973). Measuring School Climate. Trends in Education, 30.

Halpin, Andrew W. & Croft, D.B. (1963). The Organizational Climate of schools, Chicago: University of Chicago.

Hargreaves, D.H., Hester, S.K. and Mellor, F.J. (1975). Deviance in Classrooms. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Highfield, M.E. and Pinsent, A. (1952). A Survey of Rewards and Punishments in Schools. London: Newnes Educational Publishing Co..

Maccoby, E. (1967). The Psychology of Sex Differences. Stanford California: Stanford University Press.

Merrett, F., Wilkins, J., Houghton, S., & Wheldall, K. (1988). Rules, Sanctions and Rewards in Secondary Schools. Educational Studies, 14, (2), 139-149.

McNamara, E. (1986). The effectiveness of incentive and sanction systems used in secondary schools: a behavioral analysis. Durham and Newcastle Research Review, 10, 285-290.

Natriello, G. (1982). Managing Compliance in School Organizations: Comparative and Definitive Rules. New York: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association.

Pang Sun Keung, Nicholas (1992). School Climate: A Discipline View, M.Ed. dissertation, University of Hong Kong.

Peters, R.S. (1966). Ethics and Education. London: Allen & Unwin.

Smith, D.K. (1978). Teacher Styles of Classroom Management. Journal of Educational Research, 71, 277-282.

Tagiuri, R. & Litwin, G. W. (1968). Organizational Climate: Explorations of a concept. Boston: Harvard University, division of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration.

Thomas, A.R. (1976). The Organization Climate of Schools. International Review of Education, 22, 441-456.

Topping, K.J. (1983). Educational Systems for Disruptive Adolescents. London: Croom Helm.

Wertham, C. (1963). Delinquency in schools: a test for the legitimacy of authority. Berkeley Journal of Sociology, 8, 39-60.

Willower, Donald J., Terry L. Eidell and Wayne K. Hoy. (1973). The School and Pupil Control Ideology , (2nd ed.), Penn State Studies #24. University Park, PA: University of Pennsylvannia.

Wilson, P.S. (1971). Interest and Discipline in Education. London & Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Wynne, E.A. (1980). A Looking at schools: Good, bad, and indifferent. Lexington, Mass: D. C. Heath.